

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/758,702	WEBB ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shane Bomar	3672	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowed

 (1) Shane Bomar.

(3) _____.

 (2) Anthony Rahhal.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 13 October 2005
Time: 12pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

12

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Attorney Rahhal was contacted in response to the amendment filed on October 3, 2005, wherein claims 1, 7, and 12 were amended. The Examiner felt that more terminology needed to be added to amended claim 12 because the claimed restriction could technically read on the bottom of a borehole. Therefore, it was agreed to add the same limitations following the last recitation of "cementing plug" in claim 1 to the end of claim 12 via an Examiner's amendment.